

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim 1 is amended to include the limitations of claim 3, which is now canceled. The amendments are made for the purpose of expediting prosecution and not for patentability, and the claim cancellations are made without prejudice. Applicants reserve the right to pursue subject matter of the original claims (prior to amendment) and subject matter of the canceled claims in subsequent prosecution.

The rejections presented in the Office action dated March 18, 2005 have been considered. Claims 1-2, 4-14, 17-34 and 36 remain pending in the application. Applicants acknowledge the allowance of Claims 14, 17-34, and 36. Reconsideration and allowance of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Office Action does not establish that claims 1-3, and 6-10 are anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) by "Bell" (U.S. Patent No. 4,554,628 to Bell). The rejection is respectfully traversed because the Office Action does not show that all the limitations are taught by Bell. Claim 1 is amended to include the limitations of claim 3 (now canceled), however, for purposes of expediting prosecution.

Claim 1 as amended includes limitations of granting command processing priority of the processing resources to agents corresponding to the queued agent identifiers relative to other agents having ownership of the bus in an order in which the queued agent identifiers were queued relative to each other. Bell is not shown to teach or suggest these limitations.

The cited teachings of Bell (col. 5, l. 65 – col. 6, l. 50) indicate that devices that lose the bid for access to the bus re-bid for access, and the device with the highest priority in re-bidding is then granted access to the bus. Bell's devices re-bid and are granted access based on a priority. Thus, there is no apparent correspondence to the limitations of ownership of the bus being granted in an order in which the queued agent identifiers were queued relative to each other. If the rejection is maintained, an explanation is respectfully requested. Otherwise, claim 1 as amended is not shown to be anticipated by Bell.

Claim 10 is also not shown to be anticipated because the Office Action fails to show that Bell teaches any configurable pattern by which the queued agents are granted ownership. Bell's col. 6, l. 29-50 is alleged to teach these limitations. However,

there is no apparent suggestion of any configurable pattern. If the rejection is maintained, a citation is requested to the specific element of Bell thought to correspond to the claimed configurable pattern. Otherwise, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Applicants do not acquiesce with the particular rejections to the claims that depend from claim 1. However, these rejections are moot in view of the remarks made in connection with independent claim 1. These dependent claims include all of the limitations of claim 1 and any intervening claims, and recite additional features which further distinguish these claims from Bell.

Claims 1-2, and 4-10 are not shown to be anticipated by Bell because all the limitations of the claims are not shown to be taught by Bell, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are patentable over the cited prior art of record and that the application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



LeRoy D. Maunu
Reg. No. 35,274
Crawford Maunu PLLC
1270 Northland Drive, Suite 390
St. Paul, Minnesota 55120
(651) 686-6633